CANDOUR

The British Views-Letter

Founded by A. K. Chesterton in 1953 to defend National Sovereignty against the menace of International Finance

Vol. XXXV. Nos. 11 & 12 *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* November/December, 1984.

THE ASS-ID TEST

by ROSINE DE BOUNEVIALLE

Contrary to what one would suppose from a perusal of the relevant world's press ,the most significant event to occur at the time of writing is the return of Svetlana née Stalin to her native land after seventeen years sojourn in the West. She, obviously, has read the writing on the Iron Curtain if nobody else has. In syllables intelligible to the attentive observer of no matter what linquistic persuasion, it says: *Due for demolition any time now.* Plainly, Svetlana has decided that if she must again endure the Gulag wherever she lives, she might as well do so in her own language and among her own people, since when it comes to slavery, the victims in the East seem to be less deluded as to who are their masters than those in the West.

The English, Welsh, Scots and Irish are next on the list for transference of national identity. January, 1985 — that is the date appointed for Great Britain to be absorbed into the European bog. On that date we, the peoples of the British Isles, are to become subject to the European Commission *de facto* as well as *de jure,* as we have been ever since we were betrayed into the E.E.C. on January 1st, we are destined (by the International Bankers' Consortium) to disappear as a free nation and become a province of European Union. Our national extinction is, therefore, imminent — and yet not the least sense of urgency appears to pervade the majority of nationalist publications and propaganda.

Wrong Targets

On Target is delighted that the anti-Common Market issue remained "alive" at the Conservative Party Conference. It says thousands of leaflets from "Concerned Conservatives Against The Common Market" were well received at Brighton. Not a word about the overt treason and misprision of treason involved in the embracing with triumph or accepting without dispute the *fait accompli* of European Union, although so many anti-Market stalwarts had plugged the Treason issue and begged for action upon it. Instead, *On Target* and the British League of Rights sponsor a visit to this country by Ivor Benson to speak on "The Likely Future of South Africa"! The likely lack of a future for England would be a more appropriate theme for this time and place.

The British National Party, we learn from *Spearhead,* staged an October rally in Birmingham, reported to be the most successful event of its kind. The theme of the speeches was: "Whites Unite to Win Back Britain". All most laudable. It was also reported that "as a change from the speeches, there was a film showing the great nationalist rallies and marches of the 1970s and the playing on tape of a new party song". There was reported to be 180 persons there, but we cannot learn that anyone suggested actually *doing* anything to facilitate the bringing of the provable traitors to justice or even to make their continued existences somewhat less complacent than heretofore.

As for the National Front, it appears to be wholly concerned with providing *Searchlight* with ample irrelevant material for its "sniffer dogs" to unearth and its inaccurate reporters to ventilate.

With two notable exceptions — *Liverpool Newsletter* and the National Action Party — the nationalist organisations seem quite content to pursue their versions of the party game for the *next* thirty years, possibly outreaching by some little way the peaks of the 'seventies. They appear to have forgotten even the original theme, and certainly don't seem to think of practising any variation upon it. Yet, the day after tomorrow, so to speak, we shall legally and in fact cease to exist as an independent nation. Surely something more is called for than a recollection of the now disappointed euphoria of the 'seventies.

From its inception, it has been *Candour's* constant theme that all the nationalist's common sense, reasoned arguments and patriotic fervour will have less than no effect in popularising the Nation's cause, and thus recruiting to the national defence, unless they are displayed before a wider audience than our own supporters, no matter how comparatively numerous these happen to be. Our founder, A. K. Chesterton, knew this from his own experience in the

British Union, Supposing we could return to the spellbound thousands of the 'thirties, why should we "fail" and more "nobly" than Mosley did? We *still* have only the housetops to speak from. But instead of utilising these to our utmost we have settled for the "respectability" of Whitehall on Remembrance Day (remarkable only for its *lack* of remembrance of what our fathers fought for or how could we so shamefully allow it to be lost to their grandchildren), or if not Whitehall, then some not especially notable meeting-hall in Birmingham or wherever.

Two-Pronged Fork

It was equally a constant theme of *Condour* and any nationalist worthy of the name that Communism and Capitalism are two prongs of the same fork. Do we ask ourselves often enough, why a fork at all? Why doesn't our enemy carve us up with his financial knife and eat the remains with his bloody fingers? The answer is that he knows how pigheaded we are. As long as we can see the enemy and recognise his aims, we will fight, and very likely win! Look at the history of the English, Welsh, Scots and Irish. None of us is noted for "giving in", even when we are fighting one another, however disastrous our leaders. In fact, the denizens of the British Isles have proved themselves invincible in war, admirable in administration, and absolute suckers before the wiles of the money-lenders. So — the two-pronged fork. Always, always we are looking in the wrong direction. Crowns fell like confetti, the Soviet monster was conceived, suckled and reared whilst we fought "the war to end all wars" and suffered the aftermath of the financial blizzard. The subservience of the coal-owners and miners to the monopoly aliens of Imperial Chemical Industries was established whilst the strike of 1926 was engaging the eyes and thoughts of the alleged opposites of the political spectrum. The Empires followed the Crowns into the pit whilst the follow-up to "the war to end all wars" established the Money Power to master all money powers. Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks spawned the United Nations, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, whose combined machinations have borne the devil's fruit we see around us. Our Empire destroyed, our markets appropriated, the products of our genius exploited by Japs and Jews — all with Right, Left and Centre acquiescence if not exertion.

Whilst the mass media words and pictures have daily horrified and harrowed their readers and viewers with descriptions of the slings and arrows of strikes and starvation; whilst we have listened and looked at endless presentations of Arthur Scargill's belligerence, police sufferance, the Coal Board's calculated concessions, the unseemly and undeserved triumph of Mrs. Thatcher and her myrmidons, the sudden, belated awareness of all and clerical sundry to the galloping paralysis of post-colonial Africa, the encroaching violence and collaboration of revolutionaries around the world, and finally the build-up of Soviet and U.S. arms and their mutual aggression in Central America; whilst we have been directed to look at and mull over all this, at the same time being invited to contribute our "tonne" to the starving millions of Ethiopia, we are being robbed of our very country, regardless. If we would only emerge from the side-tracks, at the T-junction we would be able to see the signs on the highway: both Left and Right pointing "To The Under (one) world". If that destination is where you don't want to go, would *you* turn to the Left *or* to the Right?

So do, please, read the signs: Svetlana and her daughter, whom we have no reason to suppose she is not fond of, have returned to the Soviet Union; the East Germans say that this year a hundred of the persons in the East who want to join the West will be allowed to do so — as if no Wall existed. So the writing is on that Wall, too: if a hundred, why not a thousand? And who is to say they will be German? The British Government is to advise private concerns on what they need to know in order to build a Channel tunnel-bridge, whichever permanent link proves more expedient. The same Government has made it plain that it cares not if the miners' strike goes on "forever" — or until Europe requires British coal in exchange for Soviet gas. The White House with its charismatic septuagenerian incumbent agrees with the Kremlin that co-existence is inevitable. What does all that add up to but One World?

Those of us who would rather our country was not turned overnight into a province of the Cap-Com Gulag without any significant protest, must bestir ourselves. Once the European Union is an accomplished fact, we ourselves will then be guilty of "treason" if we continue to rebel against the all-powerful Commission. Remembering that the liberal movement is no more than a pink mirror to flatter our reflections, we may very soon find our future masters less tolerant of treason to the Commission than our present masters are of treason to the Crown.

If in the face of such open treachery, the mass of Her Majesty's subjects remain unmoved, we activists must still refuse to "retire to our villas" like the Romans supinely to await the onslaught of the barbarians, Of if we have no villa, still less can we be as the ignorant asses browsing in Cape paddocks unaware that they have been bred only to provide food for the cheetahs. The alarm is sounding again. Let us not be deaf to its demand.

TRAITORS' GALLERY, No. 2:

Mr. Richard Moore, (Liberal/S.D.P. candidate, Euro-elections).

Following the campaign to bring Lord Carrington to justice (see "I Accuse", May 1981) for betraying Rhodesia to Marxist terrorists, we hoped to inspire a similar snowball of readers activity with "Defeat This Treason", in which supporters were urged to complain to their Chief Constables about the treasonable activities of the M.E.P.s who voted for the draft Treaty of European Union. The next stage in this campaign is a direct and personal Accusation of Treason against Mr. Richard Moore, a Liberal/S.D.P. candidate in last June's Euro-elections, for which exists actual written evidence — Editor.

This Carrington-type character resides in Sussex: so the Sussex Chief Constable has again been the recipient of patriotic protests against blatant sedition made by the local activists who had accused Carrington. Unfortunately, Sir Thomas Hetherington, the Director of Public Prosecutions, has again been able to stifle protests at birth. His reply to the Sussex Chief Constable (who did his best by forwarding this latest exposure of treason to the D.P.P.) was that the Accusation of Treason was "wholly misconceived".

Richard Moore's treachery is in a different department from Carrington's. His not to give away Rhodesia, but merely his own country. Our evidence against Carrington was circumstantial, but so overwhelming as to merit police investigation. Our evidence against Mr. Moore is specific and exact. Did anyone notice during the Euro-elections farce last June that most Euro-candidates delicately forebore to mention the Treaty of European Union. But Mr. Richard Moore plunged in with Allianced feet. His election address, thrust through my letter-box, blandly stated that if elected he "would press for the ratification by the British and the other Parliaments of the Ten Member States of the draft Treaty for European Union already adopted by the European Parliament".

Seditious little rat! Without going into tedious details, one may repeat that some of the outstanding delights of the Treaty of European Union include the take-over of all property, forced participation in a common monetary system and — last but not least — the subjection of national law to Union law. We are to be citizens, not subjects, with the Monarchy no longer an integral part of our constitutional system.

Doubtless Sir Thomas Hetherington and Mr. Richard Moore are not quite so familiar with Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, the Petition of Right and the Act of Settlement as they should be. It might not be a bad idea for Sir Thomas to take down his dictionary (if he has one and look up "misprision". Any M.E.P. who voted for this draft Treaty in the European Assembly last February has broken the Treason Act of 1351 and the Treason Felony Act of 1848 ("Any act . . . which .. . . tends to weaken the power of the Queen"). How much more guilty is the insolent rodent who actually admits, in writing, that he is prepared to break both those Acts?

We have had about enough of this Sir Thomas Hetherington, too. Anyone feeling inclined to join a nationwide M.P.-bashing with the object of protesting against the D.P.P.'s co-operation with foul traitors is welcome to a copy from me of the two-page detailed Accusation against Moore free, gratis and for nothing.

H. MARGARET CRAWFORD,
13 Acreman Court,
Acreman Street,
SHERBORNE, Dorset.

TREASON!

SAVE OUR COUNTRY FROM EUROPEAN SLAVERY

Alert the public to the fact that supporting European Union is treason.

Send for our special poster.

Only £1 for 20 from

CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY

PACIFISM—NOT THE CHRISTIAN STANCE

by FRANK GLOVER

Western Christians are in danger of being drowned in a torrent of words from clerics and Commissions advocating unilateral nuclear disarmament as *the* Christian choice for peace. This is false. Terrifying as the nuclear prospect may be, it is not necessarily the worst disaster that may befall a man or mankind generally. We all have to die sometime. Better die in the freedom to worship God than live as slaves forced to deny Him.

Those who advocate unilateral nuclear disarmament by Britain make several blunders in their thinking. Firstly, such action may in fact be worse for the prospects of peace than better. It could encourage political and military adventurism where in a nuclear situation it might be too risky. Secondly, for Britain to throw away her nuclear weapons would do nothing whatsoever to guarantee her immunity from nuclear attack. The pathetic futility of areas of Britain declaring themselves 'nuclear free zones' is ludicrous to the point of daftness. In the event of a nuclear attack, do officials in those areas really believe that enemy rockets would suddenly veer away on coming within range of such notices, or that fall-out would stop at their boundaries? Even councils insane enough to make such futile declarations could hardly be daft enough to believe *that*!

Moral Consideration

But apart from the practicalities of this very real world we live in, what about the moral aspect, the matter which must concern all Christians very deeply? The first point to make is this. Pacifism is not only *not* 'the' Christian option. It only just scrapes in as *an* option. Traditional Christian teaching holds and has always held that there is such a thing as the just war, the war of self defence or of defence of another, innocent, nation being attacked. Many quotations from Catholic Christian authorities could be cited in support of the position I have outlined. One or two must suffice in a short article like this.

Fr. John Hardon S.J., in the Catholic Catechism, declared: "It must be admitted that in a world wholly governed by Christian principles war would be ruled out as at variance with the moral teaching of Christ, especially as contained in the Sermon on the Mount. But since Christians are also citizens of a secular order in which the exercise of force is sometimes necessary to maintain the authority of the law, the Catholic Church has held that the method of war and the active participation of Christians in it are on occasion morally defensible and may even be praiseworthy."

In his message on peace in January 1981, the Pope said, "Unconditional and effective respect for each one's imprescriptible and inalienable rights is the necessary condition in order that peace may reign in a society." Unless and until such universal rights are recognised, the nations are morally entitled to be adequately armed in order to protect them where they do exist. There is no doubt about the moral validity of this stance. The Pope also pointed out in his message that violation of conscience was "the most painful blow inflicted to human dignity. In a certain sense it is worse than inflicting physical death, of killing."

Those talking of peace — and every sane and good person must want that — must take fully into account precisely what peace is. It is more than mere absence of war. Account must be taken of the refugee fleeing from the evils of totalitarian and Godless Communism. Those from Vietnam, the two millions slaughtered in Cambodia, the four millions in forced labour camps in Russia — is *this* peace? The arms race is a tragedy but aggression and enslavement are also major tragedies and very real threats to human well being. Where enslavement and cruelty and the violation of basic human rights occur, there can be no true peace. Defence against such threats is legitimate and moral.

Pastoral Letters on Peace from both the German and the French Catholic Hierarchies are perfectly explicit in their view that even nuclear defence is morally acceptable to the Christian. While strongly urging all to work to attain true peace, the German Pastoral *Out Of Justice, Peace* emphasises precisely that. Peace will only come out of justice. Where such justice is manifestly absent and certain countries are strong and repressive, other countries have the right to build up their own defences. Nuclear weapons can never be the real road to peace, but, says the German Letter, there are "strict conditions under which nuclear deterrence can still be tolerated as long as it demonstrably serves to prevent war."

Quoting Pope Paul VI, the French Pastoral Letter points out: "As long as man remains the weak, changeable and even wicked being that he often shows

himself to be, defensive arms will, alas, be necessary". No claims here that pacifism is 'the' Christian stance. Precisely the opposite. Christians at present under a barrage of out-of-context quotations designed to show that the taking up of weapons is not a true Christian option would do well to read up on their tradition. Otherwise, they will be deafened by the pacifist monologue.

THE SOCIAL CREDIT PAPERS

Documents relating to proceedings at the Liverpool Parliamentary Debating Society.

£2 from Liverpool Newsletter, Rose Cottage, 17 Hadassah Grove, Lark Lane, Liverpool L17 8XH.

THE SILENT SCREAM

by ANTHONY BEAMISH

The English are rightly unhappy about Islamic methods of slaughter, even when conducted in private; and to do it in public is to invite outrage and disgust, as the Iranians found when one of their diplomats ritually slaughtered a sheep in a London street. However, how many of the vociferous animal rights lobbyists, I wonder, find equally as abhorrent the obscene slaughter that takes place of five hundred babies each day by abortion in this country? Or do they close their eyes to the *human* abattoirs? The fact that these babies are slaughtered in clinics and hospitals, and not in the gutter, should not render them less important than the slaughter of sheep.

Doctors profess to save life where possible. Indeed, the original Hippocratic Oath specifically forbade abortions. Yet every day in N.H.S. and private clinics up and down the country many members of the medical profession are destroying mercilessly innocent, newly-formed human life. It is a lie to argue that the foetus is only an appendage of the woman's body and that, therefore, she has the right to have done with it what she likes. All women who are pregnant must know that there is a *life* inside them from very early on — not some inanimate flesh and bone that can be disposed of in a hospital sluice, torn to bits by suction.

Documentary film showing a foetus being killed in an abortion operation was screened for the first time in Britain at the annual conference of the Society for the Protection of Unborn Children in October. The 10½-minute video was made by Dr. Bernard Nathanson, a New York surgeon who use to be one of America's busiest abortionists before he gradually came to realise the evil of abortion. Since his change of mind in the 1970s, he has become a vigorous campaigner for right-to-life groups. Using sophisticated ultra-sound techniques that are monitored by computer, Dr. Nathanson has produced a film portraying graphically what happens to the child during abortion. He has called the film *The Silent Scream* because the foetus opens its mouth and appears to scream as the abortionist's instruments probe about the uteris.

"First you see the child playing about a bit, and then you see the doctor's instrument inserted," he told Sandra Pajek of *The Universe*. The foetus recoils as the sac is punctured and the flued drains away. "You see the extremities (limbs) being torn from the body, and the child's mouth open in a silent scream. Then you see the head being torn off, crushed and removed piece by piece. It is a horrific piece of film, but unfortunately it is real."

The doctor performing the abortion in the film was a colleague of Dr. Nathanson. He saw the film afterwards and was so disgusted that he has never performed an abortion since. An eleven-week-old foetus was deliberately picked to film because there are pro-abortion groups in the U.S.A. who claim that at this early stage the foetus does not feel any pain. But the film makes clear that excruciating pain *is* experienced; although the mother was anaesthetised, the baby is clearly in agony.

This frightening film clearly has the potential to transform what the party politicians call "the abortion debate" and dispose once and for all of the fallacious argument that the woman has "a right to choose". Perhaps if it is shown widely on television, as Dr. Nathanson urges, the film's disgusting and horrifying scenes will shock people into a realisation that if the abortionists can kill children at any stage of their being, with the state's connivance, who knows what is in store for everybody in the future. *All* of us have an obligation to stop to think and *do* something about this outrage before it is too late.

FREEDOM: OUR NOBLEST HERITAGE

by PROFESSOR JACK DIXON

Jim Keegstra attracted nationwide attention, if not notoriety in Canada in 1982 by the revelation that his lessons included the thesis that there had been no holocaust in Europe during the Nazi regime, and that there existed a Zionist plot to control the world. Complaints by some parents initiated a preliminary hearing, as a result of which Keegstra was fired from his teaching position and his teaching certificate was revoked by the Department of Education. The hearing also resulted in the laying of charges against Keegstra under human rights legislation, of wilfully promoting hatred against Jews. The trial continues. It appears that the two issues are intimately related. Indeed, no doubt a case could be made that Keegstra's teaching stemmed from hatred, and that his anti-holocaust lessons were the means of fostering hatred. But, in fact, they must be seen to be separate and distinct issues.

Question At Issue

Having, therefore, established the necessary distinction between the two issues — namely, what he taught, and how he taught — let us examine the holocaust as fact and truth. the Nazis exterminated six million Jews in their concentration camps between 1933 and 1945. The actual number, however, is beside the point of the question at issue. That question, quite simply, is this: Are there any matters which may not be examined and questioned? Or, to put it another way: Does a free citizen of a free country have the right to examine and to question any matter he cares to?

I am not aware that there exists any list of subjects that Canadians are prohibited from discussing and challenging. Unless it is a secret list. A few years ago Trudeau's government tried to put a muzzle on all Canadians and prevent discussion of its infamous uranium cartel conspiracy. And just recently the same government had another stab at legitimate freedom of speech by trying to outlaw private citizens and groups from spending money on political statements during a federal election.

What we have here, however, is something totally different. We are dealing with an historical event. Let us declare firmly that there is absolutely no event, occurrence, theory, idea, postulate, fact, system or truth that may not be subjected to examination, discussion and questioning. No realm of knowledge or learning may be excluded or exempted from challenge — whether philosophical, historical, social, political, scientific, artistic, or even religious. I will go further. Not only must they not be exempted: it is essential that they be subjected to searching and prolonged and continuous examination. And not only the uncertain areas, but also — and especially — the certitudes and the "truths". The current biological orthodoxy is belief in Darwin's *theory* of evolution. A biologist who tamely accepts it, lock, stock and barrel, just because his professors and the textbooks proclaim it as "truth", betrays his science.

Noblest Tradition

The most priceless treasure of Western civilisation, its noblest tradition, is that of freedom. Freedom in both the political and the philosophical senses: the freedom to do what one pleases so long as one's acts do not limit another's; and the freedom to enquire into any area or field of learning.

Keegstra's history and his view of the holocaust must be allowed to fall in this tradition. He may not be seeking truth, as scholars and scientists understand it; he may only have been trying to debunk. I think he is mistaken. But it is an even greater mistake to try to muzzle or silence him. For my part I have greater confidence in the power of truth to take care of such error. It may seem that to place Keegstra in the tradition of liberty is to confer too great a dignity on his views. That may be; but we are not concerned with his views in themselves. What we are concerned with is a great principle.

It is his fundamental right to hold the opinions he does, and to publish them, whether or not he can show those opinions to have any basis. That they are extremely unpopular makes it certain that they will excite hostility. They appear to have elicited as much hatred as Keegstra is accused of offering. One might have hoped for a somewhat more tolerant and enlightened response from some of our righteous civil libertarians and human rightists, but their record over recent years ensured that they would side with Keegstra's prosecutors. They cannot tolerate views different from their "gospel" either.

While we have little doubt that Jim Keegstra's teaching avoided giving racial offence — a school governor said he could find "nothing derogatory" in his lesson — we welcome Professor Dixon's views, originally published in the Edmonton Journal, as a modest counterbalance to the B'nai B'rith-inspired media villification of Mr. Keegstra for having had the temerity to touch on the most proscribed of subjects — Editor.

MISS MEEKHEART'S LIVING

by FR. VINCENT McNABB

One Monday I heard the following — "Last week I was staying with one of my friends in the village of X———, about thirty miles from London. My friend and hostess, seeing that my knitting had come to an end for want of wool, went to buy some in the village's only draper's shop. When she asked the shopkeeper for the wool I needed, he said very apologetically: 'We don't stock wool. *That is Miss Meekheart's living*'." There ended the story. And there began my thinking.

First of all I thought it a very beautiful story and very simple. The Gael within me was on the point of writing — "very English". But, like all that is best in England, it is human. I am writing this miles away from a copy of *The Vicar of Wakefield.* But if my memory is trustworthy I behaved towards this story exactly as the Vicar of Wakefield's little son behaved when he heard a like story. Moreover, I am still impenitent of my tears.

Multiple Stores

Of course, the story was so unexpected in these days of Multiple Stores that the shopkeeper's words sent my thoughts whirling and sparkling like a Catherine-wheel. It took time to change into a steady rocketing of thought. My first definite thought was: This thing is a Survival, as the White Horse of Wilts or Salisbury Minster or Cockney wit is a survival. This village shopkeeper is a survival, and not just a successor, of the folk who set such store by good manners that, what philosophy now calls the Absolute, they called "the Courteous God."

From this I was unpleasantly forced to think of our modern Multiple Stores not as a rare and precious survival, but as a vulgar, cheap, *nouveau-riche* successor of the courteous centuries. This was not pleasant thinking, because most of my acquaintances buy all kinds of cheap nicknacks, and even cheap food-snacks at these cheap Stores.

My next thought went with middle-wicket directness straight to the heart of my religious beliefs; in other words, to the centre of my heart and brain. How was I to reconcile two facts that seemed as irreconcilable as fire and water? One fact was that most of my acquaintances believed in a good God, in a personal devil and in the Commandment. Thou Shalt Not Steal. The second fact was that these good folk were thinking God was somehow very thoughtful of them by setting them down in a progressive century, when Big Business, with its drapery-line and millinery-line and furniture-line and stationery-line and religious-object-line, and funeral-line and cremation-line, etc., enabled country cousins to spend a whole day of excitement under one roof. But for my wretched conscience the snag in this was that these many-lined Stores were the death of such courteous English folk as the draper of X——, and, I need not say, of Miss Meekheart, whose "living" was wool.

Another line of thought became such a Sierra Nevada of thinking that flight from it was my only defence. The draper of X—— was such a purveyor of goods and good-manners that he advertised the wool that was Miss Meekheart's living! Now, take this "line" of thought out into the Big Business of today and see if you are not, sooner or later, quite dizzy. Imagine yourself going to Messrs. Welfridge for a bolt of tape and hearing the answer: "We do not stock tape. That is Messrs. Soolworth's living!" Or go in spirit to the X-Y-Z caterers for afternoon tea. Would you not be put off any kind of food if Messrs. X-Y-Z, the caterers, said apologetically: "Tea is not in our line. That is Messrs. Syons' living"? After such adventures in burlesque, it is not food you would want, but stimulants.

What the draper of X—— did was, as we said, a survival. But even what he said was a survival. It was an unexpected survival in days of telephone manners and B.B.C. English of the days when the King's subjects spoke King's English. Coleridge once said that "good prose was words in their best order, and good poetry was the best words in their best order." By this canon of an authentic master of poetry and prose, the word of the draper of X—— is poetry of the highest. It is some ten years since I heard so noble and musical a word, spoken in such fit surroundings of time and place. "Living" rang in my ear as a thrush's unexpected trill of song after a thunderstorm. It was the one word that could be used; and it in such fitting place and time that it instantly came into its own.

While such folk as the draper of X—— still live in England, it is clear that England cannot die. And whilst such folk are still to be found, our hopes for England must be allowed to live. This thing that we call a survival may perhaps blossom into a revival;

when the swagger and show of today have proved themselves to be but a paroxysm in the steady culture and courteousness of our people.

Editor's note. — In the late 'twenties and early 'thirties, Fr. Vincent McNabb was the leading Distributist among the clergy, and must be ranked alongside Chesterton and Belloc as a really great Distributist writer. Unlike some Distributists, he tried to *act* upon his principles as a means of being more effective in conveying them to others: he would go to Distributist League meetings clad in home-spun and home-woven garments. Hatred of machinery combined with love of poverty to sunder him from a type-writer, and his articles for *G.K.'s Weekly,* of which "Miss Meekheart's Living" was one, were all hand-written in most exquisite and legible script. To G.K.C. he was a very dear friend, and besides their link of Distributism, both men were deeply interested in the philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas.

THE FARMER'S BOY (REVISED VERSION)

by G. C. HESELTINE

The sun had set behind the hill
When, full of erudition,
To a farmer's door a young man came,
For it was his ambition
To use his D.Sc. (Agric.)
And all his brains employ,
To cultivate and rusticate
And be a farmer's boy-oy-oy,
And be a farmer's boy.

He used the latest dynamos
For milking cows and shearing
And fitted all the heifers' tails
With epicyclic gearing,
Enabling them with greater ease
To make the flied deploy,
And teem with cream in gratitude
To such a farmer's boy-oy-oy
To such a farmer's boy.

He sowed the superphosphates wide,
And sulphates in rotation,
To show the stupid farmer what
Was what in cultivation;
And when the ear of wheat grew up
A trifle shy and coy,
He gave is ultra-violet rays,
This clever farmer's boy-oy-oy!
This clever farmer's boy!

In every sleeping heifer's ear
Suggestions he would mutter,
And they thereby subconsciously
Increased the yield of butter;
Thus, too, he taught the grunting pigs
Life's humour to enjoy,
And laughing, they made fatter pork
To feed the farmer's boy-oy-oy,
To feed the farmer's boy.

The too-prolific aphis-fly
He soon exterminated,
By Stopesian suggestions which
He subtly inculcated;
By this same means all insect pests
He managed to destroy,
So they could neither spoil the fruit
Nor bite the farmer's boy-oy-oy,
Nor bite the farmer's boy.

By means of Mendelism and
Skill in manipulation,
He crossed his hens with bees and through
Gametic segregation
The hens each laid a million eggs,
And bees ceased to annoy
By stinging or by buzzing round
The busy farmer's boy-oy-oy,
The busy farmer's boy.

By dint of double entry and
Much filing of petitions,
He sat with expert dignity
On many Royal Commissions:
Though farms and farmers are extinct
He tells with pride and joy
How he went and showed them how to be
A modern farmer's boy-oy-oy,
A modern farmer's boy.

THE LION AND THE LAMB

by ANDREI KRYLIENKO

The marriage of royalty and finance is one of the many paradoxes of modern times. One after another the scions of the royal families of Europe enter the service of international banking and financial houses as though the financial sector had never had anything to do with the dethronement of the forbears of most of the same royal families, or the implantation of democracy in their lands, which makes the crown still worn by a few nominal Heads of State a bauble of archaeological interest brought out to adorn august brows on certain carnivalesque occasions. It would seem indeed that the time has at last come for the lion and the lamb to lie down together.

The subversive activities of the financial sector have been described by a number of serious, if seldom quoted historians. They have been amply evidence in modern times from the backing given to Cromwell by Amsterdam financiers in exchange for the head of Charles I, to the millions advanced by a phalanx of American, British, German and Swedish bankers to finance the overthrow of the Romanovs and pave the way for the surrender of half of Europe to communism. Anciently, from the time of the earliest empires — Sumerian, Hittite and Egyptian — the scenario was always much the same.

Fallacies Of Democracy

The fallacies of the democratic creed have also been quite often analyzed, although even less frequently publicized. It is not necessary, however, to cite authorities to show that "democracy" (as currently practised) and self-government (the Ultima Thule of all "free", "liberated" or would-be "liberated" peoples) are no more than a device whereby the "people" is made responsible for the policies of rulers of whose existence, as such, it is for the most part wholly unaware.

The comedy of "self-government" will not bear scrutiny. No political party today can finance itself without having recourse to the financial sector, either to banks or other financial institutions, or to industry, multi-national companies of pressure groups, none of which can survive without the credits of their bankers. As the man who pays the piper calls the tune, the political parties are only a mouthpiece for their master's voice, a master by whom their programmes and candidates are duly screened before presentation to the public.

The much vaunted "right of opposition" is no less unreal. By exacting obedience from those who enjoy its favours and starving out of economic existence any genuine or potentially genuine opposition, the financial sector keeps the free expression of opinion within prudent limits. The machinery of electoral and parliamentary procedure and the semblance of open debate are merely a facade, a permanent spectacle having little to do with basic issues, which are decided elsewhere.

The paradox of the association of royalty with the sector responsible for its virtual exclusion from public life is heightened by the fact that, while the function of royalty in the past was the promotion of the common good, that of the financial sector is the accumulation of wealth through the exploitation of a monetary system that is a major factor in the decline of civilisation. For monetary disorder is as surely the ruin of civilisation today as it was, for example, the downfall of ancient Rome.

The vice of the present monetary system lies in the use of debt, instead of a monetized commodity or other monetary token, as the chief medium of exchange. In a modern industrialized country more than 98 per cent of the exchange media of the community is created by banks in the form of credits loaned into circulation at interest to finance industry and trade. This substitution of debt for traditional forms of money, which came about gradually with the rise and development of trade and industry, has in effect transferred the prerogative of issue — the exclusive right to supply the community with its money — from the Executive to the financial sector. The prerogative of issue is, however, an essential attribute of the Executive, since without it, like a Samson shorn of his hair, the Executive is powerless to withstand whoever issues the money of the community in its place.

Traditionally, the prerogative of issue was, like all privileges, the obverse of a responsibility. Monarchs were accorded it because it was indispensable for the fulfilment of their responsibility to assure the common good of their people. Today, although the financial sector enjoys the substance of the former royal prerogative, and uses it to impose its will on kings, presidents and parliaments, it has not taken over the responsibility that should go with it, namely the

promotion of the common good, and would doubtless be reluctant to do so because it (concern with the common good) could be a considerable handicap to it in the fulfilment of its primary function, the pursuit of gain.

The financial sector is not to be blamed for this development of the monetary system. The first duty of any legitimate establishment is to defend its authority; if monarchs in earlier days failed to realize that the nascent credit system infringed their prerogative, the fault lay with them as the Executive, not with the financial sector, which merely profited by their blindness.

It will perhaps be thought that through the association of royalty with the financial sector, the former by virtue of its tradition and heredity may be inclined to temper the wind of commercial ruthlessness to the shorn lamb of the community, and even succeed to some extent in ennobling a profession whose image has suffered at the hands of Shakespeare and others. Unfortunately, the system as at present structured cannot be anything but anti-social.

Disadvantages Of Debt

While there can be no objection to the lending of money to finance trade and industry, the private creation of the exchange media loaned and their denomination in terms of debt have grave technical as well as social disadvantages. One of the chief requirements for sound money is that its value should be stable. Under the present system, every time a bank loan is repaid, the purchasing power it represents ceases to exist and, the monetary circulation being correspondingly reduced, the value of the currency rises in inverse proportion. It might seem that if every bank loan repaid were promptly replaced by a fresh loan, the level of the monetary circulation would be unchanged. Other features of bank credit, however, render this solution ineffectual.

In the first place, bank loans bring into circulation money in the amount of their principal, but provide no exchange media to cover the cost of servicing them. Thus, when the banks collect their charges, the community is left short of the exchange media it needs to repay the principal, unless, of course, the banks spend back into circulation, in meeting their costs and distributing or investing their profits, the full amount they collect in charges. As a rule, however, bank charges and profits re-enter circulation only in part, or in time: for example, bonus shares have no effect on the monetary circulation unless they are pledged as security for loans, and the accumulation of ever larger reserves is equivalent to a permanent withdrawal of money from circulation. The only way these and other such shortages can be alleviated is by the grant of fresh loans, but the relief thus aforded is only ephemeral; on the one hand, the fresh loans, too, bear interest, and on the other, as soon as the goods or services produced with them are marketed, for the gross product expanded by this increment to be saleable at current prices, the monetary circulation will again have to be increased.

Secondly, credits granted by banks to finance industry constitute an addition to the exchange media of the community which is put into circulation before — sometimes long before — the goods or services produced with them are ready for marketing. In the interim, the increment to the monetary circulation will (other things being equal) raise the general level of prices, with the result that when the goods or services in question are finally marketed, the monetary circulation will no longer be adequate to allow of their economic disposal. In other words, the system itself promotes *monetary inflation,* creating a permanent imbalance between the purchasing power of the community and the volume of its product.

Thirdly, through their impact on costs and wages, the taxes that have to be levied to service the public debt exert constant *inflationary pressure on prices,* accentuating still further the monetary shortages described above.

The financial sector is thus all the time obliged to find fresh openings for lending in order to stave off the collapse of the monetary system for lack of liquidities. In lending their money, bankers naturally favour borrowers engaged in activities that earn big profits quickly, rather than the often less profitable production of necessities or commodities having greater cultural value. Large profits, attractive in themselves, are still more so when earned quickly, because the turnover of bank loans being faster, there is less risk of loss. Behind the current promotion of artificial or meretricious needs, the escalation of armaments, the proliferation of debasing forms of entertainment, the drug traffic, the toleration of material and moral pollution, and the public authorization of vice, lies the bankers screening of potential borrowers in the light of their earning capacity in order to maintain the solvency of a system that lets them feed like a cancer on the civilization they destroy.

Meanwhile, the expansion of the mass of money (debt) continues at an ever faster rate, but never fast enough to overtake the even faster growing shortage of liquidities, while the economy is ever more

violently rocked by transfers of vast masses of debt from continent to continent following on, or followed by, wildly fluctuating interest and exchange rates.

All these economic and financial miseries are to a large extent unnecessary and could be easily remedied; furthermore, until they are remedied, starting with radical reform of the monetary system, there can be no hope of curing the graver social and moral disorders of the time. There has to be a new piper and a new tune.

Measures For Reform

The first step in any genuine reform would be to separate the function of lending money from that of making it, assigning the former to bankers and restoring the latter to the Executive. Subsequent measures would be mainly a matter of good housekeeping and technical regulation. One of the more immediately necessary secondary measures would be the reduction of public debt to manageable proportions. A beginning could be made, for example, by printing money in the total amount of all outstanding loans secured by government or public stock deposited as collateral with banks. This money could be used to repay the loans; at the same time, the equivalent amount of the deposited government or public stock could be cancelled and the balance returned to its owners (the banks' customers who had deposited it). By a measure of this kind the Government would be relieved of the need to levy taxes to service the amount of the extinguished debt; the borrowers would be saved the banks' charges and able to reduce the prices of their manufactures or services accordingly, and the community would be in a position to save the money it had formerly had to pay in taxes to the Government and in higher prices to producers, or spend it in some other way. There would be no danger of inflation, because the newly printed notes would only replace cancelled credits leaving the global volume of the monetary circulation unchanged. The notes would, moreover, be sound money owned by the holders, not debt owed to and "earning" interest for banks. Backed by appropriate measures in other areas, a reform of this kind would be a useful first step towards putting the monetary system and the economy on an even keel.

For obvious reasons, such measures are unlikely to be sponsored by the financial sector, by the parliaments it controls or the communist dictators it raises to power. On the other hand, the banker-prince apprentices to high finance, as they learn the techniques of the profession and appreciate the implications of the system, might be expected to adopt a different attitude. They might even consider lending their prestige and that of the tradition they represent not only to enhance the respectability of the financial sector, but also to prepare and propose reforms that could still save from final destruction the civilization their forbears helped to create.

SOMETHING TO HIDE?

Perhaps *Candour* readers would like to learn about the following item of information concerning Mr. Edward Heath, the former Conservative Prime Minister.

In January of this year Mr. Heath was shown on West German television, together with Willy Brandt and Olaf Palme of Sweden, attending a "peace conference" which was held in Stockholm.

I wrote to Mr. Heath some weeks later to enquire what he was doing attending an unofficial "peace conference" in Sweden together with two well-known sympathisers with Marxism, but I received neither a reply nor even the courtesy of an acknowledgement. In May I wrote on the same subject to Mr. John Gummer, the Tory Party Chairman, requesting that he ask Mr. Heath to furnish me with an explanation about his activities. Mr. Gummer replied briefly to the effect that he would be in contact again. To date, he has not been, despite my having reminded him about the matter in a second letter written in June.

Willy Brandt is the current Chairman of the Socialist International. Recently, he and Olaf Palme spoke together at a Socialist International gathering in Rio de Janeiro. Brandt fell from high office in West Germany in 1974 for his involvement with the Soviet spy Guenter Guillaume, having persued an "Ostpolitik" programme of forging links with Communist East Germany. The Swede Palme has declared his sympathies with Marxism on more than one occasion.

About a year ago the Conservative Party leadership was attacked for tolerating "right-wing moles" in its ranks. Is not the real issue that the Tories have been successfully infiltrated by *left*-wing moles, and that this has been the case for a long time?

R. E. BROOKS.

FREEMASON NEWS

A Report on the Menace of Secret Societies

Single copy 33p; 10 copies £1.82 (incl. postage)

from

Candour Publishing Company,

CHRIST HIS WITNESS, THE GREAT ARCHITECT HIS GUIDE.

'In the lodge you'll find all the ritual and mystery you crave for.'

In an interview in *The Times on* October 25th, the Dean of St. Albans, the Very Rev. Peter Moore, who has risen to high rank both in the Church and Freemasonry, admitted his reasons for becoming a Mason. He joined when a chaplain at New College, Oxford, *attracted by the Craft's mystique* and because a number of his friends were members. "The element of secrecy in it interests one. You want to know why."

HOW DID THEY BUILD THOSE GOTHIC CATHEDRALS?

Dotted throughout Britain, France, Germany and the Low Countries, the great cathedrals stand today as they have stood for seven or eight hundred years. Of Europe's 180 Gothic cathedrals, 80 are in France and 35 in England — although two of those were destroyed, St. Paul's in the Great Fire of 1666, and Coventry in the Second World War. St. Paul's was rebuilt by Sir Christopher Wren, and Coventry in modern style, in the post-war period. Including the two rebuilt, only five of Britain's cathedrals were erected after the three hundred years linking the Middle Ages with the Elizabethan period.

There they stand — giant churches of amazing beauty and symmetry, filled with exquisite carving and the most delicate fluted arches. With all the technical knowledge and mechanisation of our period, there is no 'know-how' in the 20th century capable of achieving what our ancestors accomplished with the hand tools of their period. Even more astounding, they were built without pay, as a form of consecrated leisure activity. There were no tenders, contracts, mortgages, over-time strikes or union confrontations. How did they do it? One would suppose that far more effort was required to provide food, clothing and shelter than today. What time would such communities have for the intricacies and detail involved in building such beautiful cathedrals?

Many will be amazed to learn that there was, contrary to general belief, a great deal of leisure time. Thorold Rogers, Professor of Political Economy at Oxford University in the middle of the 19th century, wrote: "At that time (i.e. the Middle Ages) a labourer could provide all the necessities for his family for a year by working fourteen weeks." Lord Leverhume, a prominent figure in the "Industrial Partnership Movement" of the 18th century, wrote: "The men of the fifteenth century were very well paid." Sombart, in his study of agricultural conditions in Central Europe in the fourteenth century, "found hundreds of communities which averaged from 160 to 180 holidays a year."

The Laws Of England

Fortescue, appointed Lord High Chancellor by Henry VI, in his book *Le Laudibus Legum Anglicae* (Praise the Laws of England) said: "The King cannot alter the laws, or make new ones, without the express consent of the whole people in parliament assembled. Every inhabitant is at his liberty fully to use and enjoy whatever his farm produceth, the fruits of the earth, the increase of his flocks and the like. All the improvements he makes, whether by his own proper industry, or of those he retains in his service, are his own, to use and enjoy without the let, interruption or denial of any. If he be in any wise injured, or oppressed, he shall have his amends and satisfaction against the party offending. Hence it is the inhabitants who are rich in gold, unless at certain times upon a religious score, and by way of doing penance. They are fed in great abundance with all sorts of flesh and fish, of which they have plenty everywhere; they are clothed throughout with good woollens, their bedding and other furnuiture in their houses are of wool, and that in great score. They are also well provided with all sorts of household goods and necessary implements for husbandry. Everyone, according to his rank, hath all things which conduce to make life easy and happy.

It was in this period that the mighty Magna Carta was written, establishing the profound truth that the individual leases his life from God, sooner than Caesar or the State. Perhaps a Frenchman, Emile Lousse, Professor of History at the University of Louvain in 1955, best sums up what many Englishmen have forgotten: "What touches all should be approved of by all. The free man must also be protected in the peaceful enjoyment of his goods. He cannot be deprived of them, without his prior consent, even by the indirect method of excessive taxation or offensive war abroad. His person and his property, including his home, are inviolable. The famous Chapter 39 of the English Great Charter sums all this up for us."

The monasteries were the focal point of a deep spiritual ethos that pervaded the land. Cobbett, in his *History of the Protestant Reformation,* records that often 100,000 pilgrims at a time journeyed to Canterbury. Besides the great cathedrals, there was a parish church to every four square miles throughout the Kingdom. Turner, in the second volume of his *History of England,* claimed: "No tyranny was ever established that was more unequivocally the creature of popular will, nor longer maintained by public support; in no point did personal interest and public welfare more cordially unite than in the encouragement of the monasteries."

Prices varied little, and often fell in times of plenty. G. N. Clark, in his history *The Wealth of England from 1496 to 1760,* gives this picture of prices at the end of the Middle Ages:

"Conscious planning played a very modest part in the economy of this time. In the main the Church, the King and his servants, the municipalities, or the guilds used their limited power of social control, not to impose economic plans, but merely to prevent breaches of traditional rules and standards . . . There

was a certain stock of economic ideas. They were good ideas, though they were simple and general. Like most systematic thought at the time, these ideas were a branch of a comprehensive interpretation of the whole universe. The Church was the custodian of this interpretation, although laymen wrote pamphlets on commercial policy. The main doctrines had to do with economic justice, the principles of fair dealing. There was the doctrine that in all transactions a just price ought to be paid. This might be explained so as to mean very little more than that a seller committed a sin if he took more than the correct price, the market price; but it was often explained so as to condemn something more than simple cheating. If it penetrated a little into economic analysis, it meant that the market price itself ought to be just, and that meant, roughly speaking, that it ought to depend on the cost of production and not on unfair competition or on the power of a monopolist. There was one special sphere in which the doctrine or a just price took a form very natural in a peasant society: in the sphere of finance it took the form of condemning usury. There were texts in Scripture and in Aristotle which seemed to mean that all loans should be made without interest; and this was the official theory."

Indeed, Magna Carta had much to say about the evils of usury, and sought to protect the property of the widow, the weak and the helpless from the money-lenders. Thus it was that the fiery 19th century historian William Cobbett, after visiting Winchester Cathedral and marvelling at its beauty, told his son: "That building was made when there were no poor wretches in England called paupers; when there were no poor rates; when every labouring man in England was clothed in good woollen cloth; and when all had plenty of meat and bread and beer." (Recorded in Cobbett's *Rural Rides*.)

Thus we have a picture of a well-fed, prosperous community, working commercially or for gain about one-third of the year, and with, as Sombart says, "160-180 holidays a year". It was a period which produced an explosion of cultural advancement. It was in this period that our parliamentary system was born; that we received the great Magna Carta; trial by jury; the independent judiciary; the offices of sheriff and justices of the peace; and, of course, the great cathedrals. It was a period where the function and value of private property was well understood and protected. Once again, in Cobbett's words, "You may trust the word freedom as long as you please; but at last it comes to quiet enjoyment of your property, or it comes to nothing." It was a period which men were pleased to call "Merrye Englande".

The Gothic Style

It was in France that the first examples of Gothic architecture could be seen. In Paris the magnificent Notre Dame was commenced in 1163, and throughout France the creative explosion followed — with names like Beauvais, Laon, Amiens, Reims, Chartres, Bourges. Each was different to the other — even to the stone used. Notre Dame is white, Strasbourg pink, Rheims bright yellow, Chartres a bluish-grey.

In each there is an awe-inspiring impression of space and light when entering. Delicate arches leap to meet the carved vaults high above. The problems encountered in Saxon times regarding narrow roof spans, which had caused much trouble, were overcome by the development of the "ribbed vault" — a discovery which showed that a pointed arch will support far greater loads than the round arches used by the Romans, or the limited wooden beams of the Saxons.

Crossed arches became ribs able to support roofing structures of greater width, and with their flowering sections brought symmetry and lightness as a further enhancement. The first of all Gothic cathedrals, Saint-Denis, in Paris, set the example which others enthusiastically followed. As the choir of Saint-Denis was completed in 1144, the Abbe Suger exclaimed that "a wondrous and unbroken light pervaded the sanctuary".... And this was the whole revelation of the Gothic period — light. Was not Christ the Light of the World? And did not men pray "Lighten our darkness, we beseech Thee, O Lord"? The fervour which this new style attracted was surely a light indeed.

Historians of the period tell us how the whole community joined in the task of building. Thousands worked to erect Chartres, often harnessing themselves to carts that carried blocks of stone to the construction site, singing hymns as they toiled. Others donated gold and jewels. Thus, Chartres was built in less than forty years, with an average of 250 workmen right through that period. Others took longer, requiring generations of fund-raising and labour. The architects, rather than the primitive yokels often depicted today, were master craftsmen and men of great learning. Their techniques for calculating the stresses and strains, the loads to be carried and the geometrical form of their new style is unknown. These techniques, placing the colossal weight on the uniquely shaped pillars, allowed the use of light as never before.

This, in turn, allowed another set of craftsmen a scope they had never had previously — the makers of coloured glass windows. A riot of beautiful colours filled the naves and choirs, and illuminated the intricately carved altars. The glaziers set up their

kilns at the cathedral sites, and plied their craft — mixing mineral pigments into the hot liquid mass before it hardened. Thousands of pieces of glass, seldom larger than a hand, were joined by thin strips of lead into designs and pictures, capturing in colour the gospel, the acts and the miracles of Scripture. And, in fact, since many were unable to read, the cathedrals became "living scriptures", the Bible story being captured in the radiant colours of the stained glass windows, and the beautifully carved gargoyles and stone figures still seen today.

England Follows

Hardly had the Gothic style developed in France before it was taken up by the Ecclesiastica Anglicana. With the same craft and diligence, the same voluntary effort, the great English cathedrals were commenced, and the spires and towers pierced towards the heavens. The great names are well known — Canterbury, of course, and York; Durham and Exeter; Lincoln and Wells; Winchester and Ely; Oxford and St. Albans; and so the names roll off the tongue, each magnificent and unique. A variety or original design was captured in the disciplined dignity of those great buildings, and then spilled over into the whole range of architecture — Corn Exchanges, Guildhalls and even the cottages and mansions of the time.

The faith of the period did not confine itself to building churches and cathedrals. This was the period when the first of the public schools were founded, and in each the notion of "Christian education" was the first priority. Both Winchester College and Westminster School make claim to being the first, but whichever is right they were quickly followed by others — Eton, Harrow, Marlborough, Rugby. Winchester was founded by a parish priest — William of Wykeham — who also endowed a College at Oxford and coined Winchester's famous motto, "Manners Makyth Man".

And all without debt or usury, which was banned in the great Magna Carta.

What would they think of the British people in the 20th century, those fervent builders of the Gothic period? How would they view the concrete petrol stations and the Coca-Cola signs? What would they think of the enormous crowds worshipping the gods of football, or the pop idols? Their crowds in those days went a different way —

"And specially from every shires ende
Of Engelonde to Canterbury they wende
The holy blisful martyr for to seeke
That them hath holpen whan that they were seeke."

But the great cathedrals still stand. Perhaps in Britain's hour of need they will once again become the focal point of spiritual fervour. Perhaps the story of how they were built, and the economic climate which freed men to "labour for love" will challenge the modern preoccupation with the balance of payments and progressive taxation.

For there is a glory about those cathedrals which transcends time.

BOOKS FROM FOREST HOUSE

Isabella The Crusader by William Walsh, £1.25
We beleve Walsh to be one of the finest historians-in-depth of this century. He exposes the reality of events and the forces causing them, some of which no other historian has unearthed. This extremely valuable and difficult to obtain book tells how Queen Isabella of Castile rid her country of the Moors and used the Inquisition with success against malefactors.

Survivals And New Arrivals by Hilaire Belloc, £1.25
Belloc shows the line of advance that must be followed by those who believe and who have the capacity for apologetic. In his defence of the Catholic Faith, he displays quick wit and weighty learning and the dialectisian's subtlety or repartee.

Christ Denied by Rev. Paul Wickens, £1
An exposure of those who caused the turmoil in the Catholic Church today, focussing on George Tyrrell, Teilhard de Chardin and Karl Rahner. Fr. Wickens traces the confusion of our times directly to their ideas and shows what we must do to combat them.

MR. RON KEEN

It is with very deep regret that we record the death at the age of 63 of Mr. Ron Keen of New Zealand. He was a staunch friend of *Candour*. A patriotic campaigner of many years standing, he published an occasional, but hard-hitting, newsletter called *Phalanx*.

Ron's parents were born in Britain and he served in the 2nd N.Z.E.F. in the Second World War. He once told a reporter from the Auckland *Sunday Herald*: "I feel very strong ties with countries populated by our kindred folk. These ties are being neglected today. We are one of the few racial groups in the world which does neglect its own folk like this. I think racial ties are very important. This doesn't infer that we mean hatred to one or the other. It means nothing of the sort, but I think maintaining our race is very important." The greatest danger facing Britons everywhere, he reflected, is "the silent majority that just lets things happen." Such people sit back and moan, he said, "but they are not *doing* anything about it." How right he was. We shall sadly miss Ron Keen.

LIGHT AND BITTER

by JANUS

When Comrade Scargill's emissaries visited Libya a howl of condemnation engulfed the N.U.M. for consorting with the "vile" and "odious" Colonel Gadaffi. Yet for some time Scargill's shock troops have been receiving aid from various bodies in the Soviet Union and elsewhere behind the Iron Curtain, where not a soul would dare to lift a finger without the Kremlin's approval — and I don't recall Messrs. Kinnock or Willis commenting adversely on *that*. In every possible respect, the Communist bloc is as bad as Libya, with no free unions or free anything else. And whatever may be said of the Arabs, at least they don't threaten our independence by armed force.

* * * *

Security was tight at the Sinn Fein conference in Dublin last month. The press reported hefty, sullen stewards carrying out spot searches and identity checks. Weren't the delegates' sunglasses and army surplus anoraks sufficient credentials? There were even I.R.A. "bomb disposal experts" on hand to give the Mansion House a going-over. What on earth so concerned them? The fear that an absent-minded Provo might plant an explosive through sheer force of habit?

* * * *

The sycophantic plaudits accorded the Earl of Stockton on his maiden speech in the Lords didn't surprise me. When Prime Minister, Harold Macmillan possessed no skill so highly developed as that of deceiving the people who trusted him. Twenty-five years on, his "winds of change", which accelerated the Empire's demise, have backfired, as the descent towards doom in Black Africa testifies. However, not even the spectre of famine-ravaged Ethiopia will convince besotted Tories that Super-Mac's gifts were essentially those of the political racketeer.

* * * *

The Editor & Staff of Candour wish readers A Happy Christmas and Prosperous New Year.

My crack the other month that we might soon see Trafalgar Square renamed to protect French feelings wasn't that far wide of the mark. The *Daily Star* reports that some Euro-M.P.s actually want the name of Waterloo Station changed because it commemorates our victory over Boney. Not Brussels likely — even if it *does* bring back "offensive" memories of war between two E.E.C. countries. This sheer, barefaced effrontery, would you believe, is supposed to "promote greater harmony"!

DIPLOMATIC IMPUNITY

Is the Entente Cordiale,
With Scotland Yard made Aunty Sal
By the Surette Generale
Of France?

Explosives hid make for Mal-
De-Tete for Margaret and pal,
Mitterand. Apres le bal —
No dance!

Gesture metaphorical
So un-ambassadorial,
Two fingers for fraternal
Romance?

As for tunnel sous Canal
Anglasis, 'tis now conjectural;
Word disturbing Brits' morale —
"La Manche".

B. E. BIGGS.

OPEN SESAME is an anthology of the poems by B. E. Biggs that have been published in "Candour" over the past fifteen years. Only £1 from Candour Publishing Co.

NEW CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K.	**£4.50**
Overseas airmail	**£5.00**
U.S.A. Dollar Rate	**$10.00**

Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants GU33 7DD

Published by Candour Publishing Co. (Editor: R. de Bounevialle), Forest House, Liss Forest, England and Printed by Farnham Printing Co. Ltd.